



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/732,850	12/10/2003	Marvin L. Green	IN-5587	8857
26922	7590	07/31/2007		
BASF CORPORATION Patent Department 1609 BIDDLE AVENUE MAIN BUILDING WYANDOTTE, MI 48192			EXAMINER NILAND, PATRICK DENNIS	
			ART UNIT 1714	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/31/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LORI.HASS@BASF.COM  
MARJORIE.ELLIS@BASF.COM  
CDavenport@CantorColburn.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

MAILED  
JUL 27 2007  
GROUP 1700

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/732,850  
Filing Date: December 10, 2003  
Appellant(s): GREEN ET AL.

---

Anna Budde  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 4/18/07 appealing from the Office action mailed 8/28/06.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

2002/0155278	BOISSEAU ET AL.	10-2002
5872195	GREEN ET AL.	2-1999
5756213	OHRBOM ET AL.	5-1998

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

A. Claims 1-3 and 7-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. Application Publication No. 2002/0155278 Boisseau et al..

Boisseau discloses coating compositions and coating methods falling within the scope of the instant claims at the abstract; sections [0019], [0022], [0026] which falls within the scope of the instant claims 12 and 14, [0038]-[0043] which falls within the scope of the instant claims 9-10, [0048] of which the oligomeric film formers fall within the scope of the instant claims as they are not polymeric since they are oligomeric and they can be further polymerized and are thus monomers, [0050] which falls within the scope of the instant claim 2, [0098], [0099], [0105] which falls within the scope of the instant claim 15; and the remainder of the document.

The appellant argues that the patentee requires the film former to be oligomeric or polymeric, not monomeric. The instant claims and the enabling specification do not exclude oligomers, which are not polymers as is clear from the appellant's arguments relating to the prior 112 rejection, by recitation of "non-polymeric". The oligomers of the reference react further to give higher molecular weight polymer when cured and are therefore necessarily

“macromonomers” as the term is well understood in the art and are thus “monomeric”. This rejection should therefore be affirmed.

B. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. Application Publication No. 2002/0155278 Boisseau et al. in view of US Pat. No. 5872195 Green et al. and US Pat. No. 5756213 Ohrbom et al..

Boisseau et al. discloses coating compositions and coating methods falling within the scope of the instant claims at the abstract; sections [0019], [0022], [0026] which falls within the scope of the instant claims 12 and 14, [0038]-[0043] which falls within the scope of the instant claims 9-10, [0048] of which the oligomeric film formers fall within the scope of the instant claims as they are not polymeric since they are oligomeric and they can be further polymerized and are thus monomers, [0050] which falls within the scope of the instant claim 2, [0098], [0099], [0105] which falls within the scope of the instant claim 15; and the remainder of the document.

Boisseau et al. does not disclose the instantly claimed monomers of claims 4-6.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use the instantly claimed monomers of claims 4-6 as the film forming agent of Boisseau et al. because Boisseau et al. encompasses such film formers at sections [0048] through [0098] and Ohrbom, columns 2 through 8, which falls within the scope of the instant claims 5-6, and the ordinary skilled artisan would have expected the benefits of these film formers as taught by Green (abstract) of which compound c falls within the scope of the instant claim 4, combined with the benefits of the urea compounds of Boisseau et al..

The appellant argues that the patentees require the film formers to be oligomeric or polymeric, not monomeric. The instant claims and the enabling specification do not exclude oligomers, which are not polymers as is clear from the appellant's arguments relating to the prior 112 rejection, by recitation of "non-polymeric". The oligomers of the references react further to give higher molecular weight polymer when cured and are therefore necessarily "macromonomers" prior to curing as the term is well understood in the art and are thus "monomeric". This rejection should therefore be maintained.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

**A. In response to the appellant's arguments regarding the anticipation rejection of paragraph 9A. above:**

**Page 10, lines 4-5 of the appellant's specification states "Higher oligomer products are also possible, but not preferred." clearly indicating that the instantly claimed inventions encompass the "oligomers" of the prior art cited above.** This appears to rebut the appellant's argument that their "coating composition is non-polymeric, unlike the polymeric and oligomeric coatings described in Appellant's background, page 2, paragraphs [0003] and [0004] and exemplified in the Boisseau publication."

In response to "112" rejections made in prior prosecution of this application, the appellant argued "Examples of monomeric materials are presented in the specification in paragraphs [0013] to [0027] and the U.S. patent references cited therein." It is again noted that paragraph

Art Unit: 1714

[0020], page 10, lines 4-5 of the instant specification includes “oligomers” as the instantly claimed “monomers” which is contrary to the appellant’s arguments in this regard. Thus, the examiner’s position is that the “oligomers” of Boisseau et al. fall within the scope of the instant claim language, including “non-polymeric” and “monomeric material” based on the appellant’s own definition of their invention at page 10, lines 4-5 of the instant specification. It is not seen that the appellant’s cited definition of “oligomer” overcomes the instant specification recitation that “oligomers” are included as part of the instantly claimed invention. The appellant’s cited definition of “monomer” also does not define over their specification’s inclusion of oligomers as falling within the scope of the monomers being described at page 10, lines 4-5. The “oligomers” of Boisseau et al. are reacted with the reference’s crosslinking agents to become “one or more constitutional units of” the crosslinked larger polymer molecule that results from the crosslinking reaction of Boisseau et al. and thus the “oligomers” of Boisseau et al. literally meet the appellant’s cited definition of “monomer” not to mention the appellant’s specification includes oligomers as falling within the scope of the claimed invention at page 10, lines 4-5. Thus, the examiner’s reference to “macromonomers” and his assertion that the oligomers of Boisseau et al. fall within the scope of the instant claims are clearly not contrary to the appellant’s specification and the IUPAC definitions of these materials.

Furthermore, sections [0044]-[0046] et seq. of the instant specification include polymeric substances among the instantly claimed “monomeric materials” and “non-polymeric coating compositions” as being within the scope of the instantly claimed invention, since this compound is based on a “polyester”. In fact, many of the disclosed “monomeric material having a plurality of active hydrogen groups” are also oligomeric or polymeric. Therefore, the appellant’s

Art Unit: 1714

disclosure clearly includes Boisseau et al.'s oligomers within the scope of the instantly claimed invention.

The above anticipation rejection should therefore be affirmed.

B. In response to the appellant's arguments regarding the obviousness rejection of paragraph

9B. above:



The above arguments regarding the “oligomeric” active hydrogen containing compounds of Boisseau et al. falling within the scope of the instantly claimed “monomeric materials” and “non-polymeric” of the instant claims is again repeated and applied to the secondary references in view of the appellant’s disclosure which explicitly includes “oligomers” and uses “polymers” in its examples.

Appellant’s belief that the array of cited compounds of Ohrbom do not include lactone or hydroxyl carboxylic acid is not persuasive regarding claim 4 which does not require these compounds and ignores the relevant sections of the cited parts of the Ohrbom et al. patent that does have these compounds such as column 6, lines 47 et seq. and column 7, lines 31 et seq.

The appropriate rationale and motivation to combine the references is given above, particularly since Boisseau et al. broadly encompasses such compounds. There is no unexpected result for the components of claims 4-6. These compounds of Ohrbom and Green will have the same functional groups as those of Boisseau et al. and are therefore expected to have the resistance to sag. No evidence to the contrary is seen.

For these reasons, this rejection should be maintained.

#### **(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner’s answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Art Unit: 1714



Patrick Niland  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1714

Conferees:

/Vasu Jagannathan/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1700

/Kathryn Gorgos/

Kathryn Gorgos  
TC 1700 TQAS